

Application No. 08/938,468
Amendment "I" dated October 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed September 22, 2005

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 22, 2005 considered claims 47-66. Claims 47-64 are indicated as being directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 65 and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, but also indicated as being allowable over the art of record.

Initially, it will be noted that although this amendment is being filed after Final, it should be entered inasmuch as it places the claims in immediate condition for allowance and does not raise any new issues for consideration.

By this paper, claims 62, 65 and 66 have been amended.¹ No claims have been cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Accordingly, following this paper, claims 47-66 remain pending, of which claims 47, 54, 56, 57, and 61 are the only independent claims at issue.

Dependent claim 62 has been amended to correct a minor grammatical error in the recited claim language. The amendment should not be construed as a narrowing amendment in any way inasmuch as the Examiner has indicated that claim 62 is already allowable and because the amendment has not been made in response to any rejection, but rather to fix a minor informality.

Dependent claims 65 and 66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, dependent claims 65 and 66 were rejected as being hybrid claims directed to methods, wherein the underlying base claim is directed to a system. As reflected in the above claim listing, claims 65 and 66 have been

¹ Amendments have been made to incorporate minor changes directed at correcting informalities and grammar within the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not add new matter, and that the claims, as amended, are fully supported throughout the specification and claims of Applicants' originally filed application.

Application No. 08/938,468
Amendment "I" dated October 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed September 22, 2005


amended and the term "method" has been replaced with "system." As a result, amended claims 65 and 66, as well as claim 47 from which the claims depend, are each directed to systems. Particularly in light of these amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 65 and 66 are not hybrid claims and that the rejections to claims 65 and 66 have been overcome. As claims 65 and 66 depend from an allowable base claim, Applicants also respectfully submit that such claims are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all claims should now be found in condition for prompt allowance. It will also be noted that the present amendment is being filed without an RCE inasmuch as the claims are now in condition for immediate allowance.

In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or corrected by Examiner amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 26 day of October, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

CUSTOMER NO. 47973

JCJ:CCN:ppa
PPA0000001454V001